

# County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-8523

FAX (513) 723-9748

## Special District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes

November 1, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room

Room 603, County Administration Building

Cincinnati, OH 45202

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:15 a.m. Two Committee Members, Mr. Seitz & Mayor Savage, were not present due to being out of town.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Bass, Riddiough, Pettit, Beck, Bass and Cron. Also present were David Wagner, formerly the Chairman of the OPWC; Ted Hubbard, Chief Deputy County Engineer; Brian Pickering & Rem Garg from the City of Cincinnati's Engineering Division.

Mr. Sykes moved approval of the May 24, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mr. Mendes and passed unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill introduced the new support member, Mr. Joe Cron who is the Engineer for the City of Montgomery.

Mr. Cottrill announced that 135 requests for grant-funded projects were received in addition to applications for 9 loan-funded projects, plus two requests for bond interest funding through the credit enhancement process.

By applying the criteria delineated in the Round 11 Rating System, the District Liaison surmised that three projects from Rounds 8 and 9 had become "delinquent", based on information contained in letters copied to the District. Specifically, the letters informed the receiving jurisdictions that one of their existing Project Agreements would be terminated, unless the OPWC received an acceptable request for a time extension within 10 days of the letter's date. Two of the letters, both dated March 6, 1995, provided information regarding MSD's Project No. CB801/Trenchless Technology Sewer Rehabilitation Project and the City of Cincinnati's Project No. CBF05/Vine Street & Forest Intersection Improvements. The third letter, which was dated January 17, 1996, afforded notice to the City of Reading regarding their Project No. CB914/East Mechanic Street Culvert, advising them of the same concern.

Special District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes November 1, 1996

Mr. Cottrill stated the rating system for Round 11 was approved by the Committee on May 24, 1996. After the approval was given by OPWC, he spoke by telephone with our District Representative, Cathy Concilla, who brought to his attention that there were some jurisdictions in District #2 that had received "delinquent letters" for Round 8 or Round 9 projects. When questioned by Mr. Cottrill about the classification of projects that were the subject of the "delinquent letters", Ms. Concilla replied that OPWC considered the projects to be delinquent once the letters were generated and mailed. (Mr. Cottrill explained that these letters are automatically generated by OPWC's computerized database system when the project is 60 days or more past the date listed in the funding application. An original letter is mailed to the jurisdiction and one copy mailed to the Liaison Officer for the appropriate District.) Upon reviewing his files covering those funding rounds, Mr. Cottrill confirmed that notification letters had indeed been sent to the affected jurisdictions, and that copies were included in the package of documents provided to each member for today's meeting.

Discussion began regarding how the definition of "delinquent projects" as specified in the Rating System Addendum was to be applied to Round 11. Mr. Heile spoke about the second sentence under Ability to Proceed, which stated that "A project is considered delinquent when it has not received notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC." He then proceeded to read verbatim what Mr. Cottrill had said at the April 18, 1996 meeting briefly indicating that as of then, April 18, 1996, every single jurisdiction in our District was in compliance with OPWC timewise. Mr. Heile contended that a sponsoring jurisdiction had to meet a "two-part test" before one or more of its projects were judged to be considered "delinquent", a project had to meet a "two-part test" by

- 1) not receiving a Notice to Proceed within the time stated on the original application AND
- 2) not having received a time extension

In order to assist the Committee in dealing with the matter of "delinquent projects", a speaker phone call was placed to Cathy Concilla of OPWC. Mr. Heile indicated that the District was having difficulty interpreting the statement regarding this in our Rating Criteria, but contended once more that a project had to meet the "two-part test" before it was considered delinquent. The Committee was reminded that this matter was discussed at the April 18, 1996 meeting, and that the minutes appear to backup that interpretation.

Mr. Cottrill asked Ms. Concilla if a vote was necessary by the Committee to change the rating system at this time. She indicated that it sounded as if all the Committee members were generally in agreement with Mr. Heile's explanation, so that no vote would be necessary to apply the interpretation to this year's projects. She then stated that it appears to be something that needs review and possible revision before the next funding round.

At this point, Mr. Heile referred to a letter to the Integrating Committee from the City of Cincinnati, expressing concern over the manner in which the criteria had been applied to the projects submitted by the City of Cincinnati, MSD and the City of Reading.

Special District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes November 1, 1996

Mayor Brooks noted that he was under the impression that the Integrating Committee was able to deal with each case on its own merits, basing judgement on the technical advice of the Support Staff. Mr. Brayshaw thought that Ms. Concilla had clarified the question to the point that only the status of the MSD project remained to be resolved.

With the Committee reaching consensus on the question, Mayor Brooks made a motion recognizing that both the Integrating Committee and OPWC had agreed that neither the City of Cincinnati's Project No. CBF05 (Vine Street at Forest & Woolper) nor the City of Reading's Project No. CB914 (East Mechanic Street Culvert) were in a state of delinquency because a time extension had been granted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sykes and passed unanimously.

After the motion was adopted, Mayor Brooks asked for the minutes to reflect the appreciation of the Integrating Committee for the efforts of the Support Staff, that they had worked diligently in dealing with this matter, and that the ambiguity should not be considered an oversight. Mr. Brayshaw agreed, explaining he wanted the question to be considered by the Integrating Committee after it had been examined and discussed by the Support Staff.

Pursuing a suggestion by Mr. Prem Garg, Mr. Brayshaw recommended that the Support Staff attempt to facilitate the information flow between the District and the OPWC staff so the Committee can be apprised regarding the status of previously funded projects. This action would tend to reduce the need for the Integrating Committee to decide these matters since the Support Staff could monitor project schedules so that jurisdictions with projects approaching delinquency deadlines can be notified of the consequences of further delay.

At this point, Bob Bass, speaking as the member of the Support Staff who authored the involved portion of the current rating system, indicated that it was his intent to hold a jurisdiction to the schedule established in the application. Further, if a jurisdiction was diligently working towards bidding the project on schedule, it **WOULD** realize that an OPWC time extension would be needed long before the date specified in the Agreement. While we have apparently solved the "problem" for this particular funding round, the District still needs to address this concern in the future. To this end, the Support Staff should meet with Ms. Concilla to determine how the delinquency question can be addressed, with the intent of making sure that the projects move along in a timely manner.

Mr. Sykes questioned how the Committee should respond to the City's letter about how the rating criteria was to be applied for the Round 11 projects. Mr. Heile, speaking on behalf of the City about the content of the letter, indicated that the letter was not intended to express criticism towards the Committee or the Support Staff, but was written to establish the City's position on the question before the Committee. Mr. Mendes added that the serious tone of the letter was prompted by the City's realization that it would be the only jurisdiction actually penalized if the rating criteria were applied in the "alternative" manner. (MSD would likely still receive its loan funding and Reading's project rating placed it lower on the list, in a position where 5 points added or subtracted would have no effect on its funding potential for Round 11.) Since the matter was resolved today to the satisfaction of the City of Cincinnati, no response to the letter is expected or necessary.

Special District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes November 1, 1996

Mr. Brayshaw stated that the Committee still had to deal with the question of the possibility of delinquency of MSD's Trenchless Technology project. He introduced Mr. Joe Niehaus from MSD who explained the reasons behind the scheduling problems with this project, problems that he characterized as being beyond the control of MSD. In summary, the project was divided into three portions and bids were taken. The Bidder on Part II based his bid on use of material that was not then approved. Rather than award the work to the Contractor who was second and who was also low on Part I, the Director of MSD decided to re-advertise for bids on Part II. The matter was the subject of court action all of which delayed start of work on Part II. Parts I and III have been completed.

Mr. Huddleston acknowledged that MSD might be guilty of a technical default which might be applied in a manner to "punish" them in this funding round. But he felt that the Committee could, with a clear conscience, waive the infraction based on the circumstances involved.

Mr. Brayshaw agreed and stated that it will be up to the Integrating Committee to decide if the penalty will be waived for MSD in this funding round.

Mr. Wagner stated that one important thing that Ms. Concilla said, and this is the fundamental basis of the program, that it is locally generated. OPWC will not turn down a project submitted to them for approval unless it is in conflict with the law and statutes, or in conflict with the District's rules. The District can create the kind of rules they wish and if they are approved, OPWC is going to hold you to them. They normally don't turn down projects. The same thing with default. Larry Bicking will work with people that are in situations just like MSD. Their prime concern is getting money out and not penalizing good projects. The whole purpose is to keep the money flowing and jobs moving. Another extension can be granted under the extenuating circumstances that exist for MSD.

Mr. Heile proposed a motion that would approve NOT imposing the penalty on the MSD project at this stage if they can obtain the appropriate extension from OPWC. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hamner and approved unanimously.

Mr. Cline requested a clarification on the motion, asking if it were possible to get that extension requested soon, which Mr. Niehaus acknowledged.

Small Governments Committee - Mr. Sykes stated no report as they have not met since our last District #2 meeting.

Mayor Brooks nominated Mr. Sykes to serve as Vice Chairman of District #2. The Committee was in agreement.

After discussion it was decided to meet on Friday, December 13, 1996. This date was agreeable to the Members that were present. A telephone solicitation will be taken.

Mr. Heile moved adjournment, seconded by Mr. Sykes and approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned 9:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Joan Cornelius*

Joan Cornelius  
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff

# ***Round 11 Schedule***

## **Appeal Period by Jurisdictions**

**Monday, October 28, 1996 through Monday, November 4, 1996**

## **Appeals Field Checks & Hearings**

**Wednesday, November 6, 1996 through Wednesday, November 13, 1996**

## **Final Priority Listing of Project Applications & Results of Appeals Mailed**

**Friday, November 22, 1996**

## **Vote on Round 11 Priority Listing of Projects**

**Friday, December 6, 1996**

## **Round 11 Priority Listing Filed With OPWC**

**As soon as possible after December 6, 1996.**

**SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM**  
**ROUND 11 - PROGRAM YEAR 1997**  
**PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA**  
**JULY 1, 1997 TO JUNE 30, 1998**

**ADOPTED BY THE INTEGRATING COMMITTEE**  
**May 24, 1996**

**JURISDICTION/AGENCY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF PROJECT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PRELIMINARY SCORE FOR THIS PROJECT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FINAL SCORE FOR THIS PROJECT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RATING TEAM:** \_\_\_\_\_

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
|    |   | <u><b>POINTS</b></u> |
| 1) | If <i>SCIP/LTIP</i> funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?   |                      |
|    | 10 Points - Will be under contract by end of 1997 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 8 & 9.   | _____                |
|    | 5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9.               |                      |
|    | 0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had more than one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9. |                      |
| 2) | What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced or repaired?   |                      |
|    | 25 Points - Failed  |                      |
|    | 23 Points - Critical  | _____                |
|    | 20 Points - Very Poor   |                      |
|    | 17 Points - Poor  |                      |
|    | 15 Points - Moderately Poor   |                      |
|    | 10 Points - Moderately Fair   |                      |
|    | 5 Points - Fair Condition   |                      |
|    | 0 Points - Good or Better   |                      |

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for *SCIP/LTIP* funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

# ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM

## DEFINITIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

### Criterion 1 - ABILITY TO PROCEED

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and OPWC defined delinquent projects. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently cancelling the same after the bid date on the application may be considered as having a delinquent project.

### Criterion 2 - CONDITION

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, or health, safety and welfare issues. Condition is rated only on the existing facility being repaired or abandoned. If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project. (Documentation may include ODOT BR-86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included with the original application.)

#### Definitions:

FAILED CONDITION - Requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (e.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: completely non-functioning and replacement parts are unavailable.)

CRITICAL CONDITION - Requires moderate or partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway, curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: some non-functioning, others obsolete and replacement parts are unavailable.)

VERY POOR CONDITION - Requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or minor replacement of pipe sections; Hydrants: non-functioning and replacement parts are available.)

POOR CONDITION - Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs; Hydrants: functional, but leaking and replacement parts are unavailable.)

MODERATELY POOR CONDITION - Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair; Hydrants: functional and replacement parts are available.)

**OHIO  
PUBLIC WORKS  
FOR YOU**

**THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION**  
65 East State Street, Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215

**COMMISSIONERS**

Chairman –  
Daniel E. Whitmire  
Vice Chairman –  
Richard O. Moore

Betty Davis  
Henry C. Hollinger  
William N. Morgan  
William S. Newcomb Jr.  
David H. Wagner Jr.

**DIRECTOR**

W. Laurence Bicking

March 6, 1995

CERTIFIED MAIL

David Krings  
Co. Administrator  
Hamilton County  
County Administration Bldg. Room 603  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

RE: Project No. CB801 / TRENCHLESS TECHNOLOGY SEWER REHABILITATION

Dear Mr. Krings

The above referenced project has not moved forward in accordance with the project schedule set forth in Appendix A of our agreement.

The Commission is concerned that projects move forward in a timely manner to provide usable infrastructure to Ohio's residents, and that its funds enhance employment opportunities and improve the economic welfare of the people of the State.

Since State resources to assist local infrastructure improvements are limited and there are many worthy projects that can move forward on a timely basis. The Commission desires to terminate your agreement in order that other projects may be funded.

In accordance with Section 5. of our agreement, Project Schedule, the Commission intends to terminate this agreement. You may apply for an extension of the date to initiate construction provided that the project will start and be completed within a reasonable time frame

Generally, requests to extend the project schedule will not be approved if your schedule lends itself to funding in a future program year.

This agreement will be formally terminated unless we receive your request for an extension within ten business days.

Sincerely,

W. Laurence Bicking  
Director

cc: Thomas Quinn  
Cathy Concilla  
District Committee

*behind schedule*  
*over now 95*  
*cut to 1/2*  
*complete*  
*ag. 96*  
*last request*  
*disbursed*

*been advised by loan*  
*official - OH not*  
*it sent*  
*there have been*  
*disbursements*



**OHIO  
PUBLIC WORKS  
FOR YOU**

**THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION**  
65 East State Street, Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215

**COMMISSIONERS**

Chairman -	Betty Davis
Daniel E. Whitmire	Henry C. Hollinger
Vice Chairman -	William N. Morgan
Richard O. Moore	William S. Newcomb Jr.
	David H. Wagner Jr.

**DIRECTOR**

W. Laurence Bicking

March 6, 1995

John F. Shirey  
City Manager  
The City of Cincinnati  
Room 152, City Hall 801 Plum Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

ROUND 8

completed any.

RE: Project No. CBF05 / VINE STREET AT FOREST AND WOOLPER INTERSECT

Dear Mr. Shirey

Our records indicate that the above referenced project has not moved forward in accordance with the project schedule set forth in Appendix A of our agreement.

Since the project bid date agreed to has passed, and we have not received a Request to Proceed for construction, we assume the project is inactive.

The Commission is concerned that projects move forward in a timely manner to provide usable infrastructure to Ohio's residents, and that its funds enhance employment opportunities and improve the economic welfare of the people of the State.

Since State resources to assist local infrastructure improvements are limited, the Commission intends to terminate your project and release its funds to your district in order that other projects may be funded.

You may apply for an extension of the project schedule, provided that the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.

Generally, requests to extend the project schedule will not be approved if your schedule extends in to a future construction season.

In accordance with Section 5 of our agreement, Project Schedule, our agreement will be formally terminated unless we receive a Request to Proceed for construction, or request for extension within ten business days

Sincerely,

W. Laurence Bicking  
Director

cc: Jay Gala  
Cathy Concilla  
District Committee

614-466-0880

**OHIO  
PUBLIC WORKS  
FOR YOU**

**THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION**  
65 East State Street, Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215

**COMMISSIONERS**

Chairman –  
Daniel E. Whitmire  
Vice Chairman –  
William N. Morgan

Betty Davis  
Henry C. Hollinger  
Richard O. Moore  
William S. Newcomb Jr.  
David H. Wagner Jr.

**DIRECTOR**

W. Laurence Bicking

January 17, 1996

Hon. Frank Carnevale  
Mayor  
The City of Reading  
1000 Market Street  
Reading, OH 45215

*fine June closed out*

RE: Project No. CB914 / EAST MECHANIC STREET CULVERT

Dear Mayor Carnevale

Our records indicate that the above referenced project has not moved forward in accordance with the project schedule set forth in Appendix A of our agreement.

Since the project bid date agreed to has passed, and we have not received a Request to Proceed for construction, we assume the project is inactive.

The Commission is concerned that projects move forward in a timely manner to provide usable infrastructure to Ohio's residents, and that its funds enhance employment opportunities and improve the economic welfare of the people of the State.

Since State resources to assist local infrastructure improvements are limited, the Commission intends to terminate your project and release its funds to your district in order that other projects may be funded.

You may apply for an extension of the project schedule, provided that the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.

Generally, requests to extend the project schedule will not be approved if your schedule extends in to a future construction season.

In accordance with Section 5 of our agreement, Project Schedule, our agreement will be formally terminated unless we receive a Request to Proceed for construction, or request for extension within ten business days

Sincerely,

  
W. Laurence Bicking  
Director

cc: Bruce Brandstetter  
Cathy Concilla  
District Committee

614-466-0880

# City of Cincinnati



John F. Shirey  
City Manager

Room 152, City Hall  
801 Plum Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
Phone (513) 352-3241  
Fax (513) 352-6284

October 31, 1996

Mr. William W. Brayshaw, P.E., P.S.  
Chairman, Issue 2 Integrating Committee  
700 County Administration Building  
138 East Court Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

RE: Round 11 SCIP/LTIP Rating Criteria

Dear Mr. Brayshaw:

I am writing to correct an outrageous misstatement of fact contained in the letter dated October 25, 1996, signed by Mr. Cottrill on your behalf. That letter states that "One set of ratings imposes a 5 point penalty under rating criteria 1, *as approved by the Integrating Committee on May 24, 1996, ...*" (emphasis added).

This assertion is absolutely untrue. The policy adopted by the Integrating Committee clearly does not apply to Round 11 City of Cincinnati projects, as evidenced by the excerpt of the April 8, 1996 Integrating Committee meeting which preceded the vote on the rating system (copy attached).

The misrepresentation contained in the October 25, 1996 letter, and any attempt to contort Committee policy for the apparent purpose of eliminating the legitimately ranked City of Cincinnati projects, is totally unacceptable.

Respectfully,

John F. Shirey  
City Manager

Attachment

01 : 44 : 16 : 000

RECEIVED  
OCT 31 1996

## Transcript from District 2 Integrating Committee Meeting April 18, 1996

Source of transcript is audio tape of meeting, Side 1, starting at Tape Counter location #0136.

District Liaison Joe Cottrill speaking, explaining the recommended Rating Criterion #1 for Round Eleven, *Ability to Proceed*, and how this criterion would affect jurisdictions that would be submitting projects for Round Eleven funding -

"Now I can report to you this morning that, as of right now, there are no jurisdictions which would be penalized. However, that does not mean, by this fall there will be, because there are a lot of dates between now and October that construction must start on certain - or at least the bids must be taken. So there are - there is, possibility that someone could be delinquent, but as of right now, the projects that have not met their schedules, they did do their paperwork and got project schedule changes; they are allowed one time on a project. So right now, every single jurisdiction in our District is in compliance timewise."

RHC - 10/1/96

# County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

108 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1258

PHONE (513) 612-8323

FAX (513) 723-9745

60th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes  
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room  
Room 603, County Administration Building  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

April 18, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:10 a.m. Mr. Hamner was the only Committee Member not present.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Beck, Pettit, Schlimm, Bass and Vogel. Also present was Prem Garg from the City of Cincinnati.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the February 2, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mr. Mendes and passed unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill explained the District 2 Integrating Committee listing of members stressing that all terms expire on May 31, 1997 and the respective members should see to it that their appointing authorities are advised so the member can be reappointed for an additional three year term before their term expires.

A request was received from Colerain Township to amend two of its project agreements (CBG09 and CBG04), transferring funds from one LTIP project to another within the same general area. This procedure, which we have utilized previously, will result in no net change of funds being dispersed to Colerain Township. Mr. Sykes moved that the project amendment for Colerain Township be approved; seconded by Mayor Brooks and approved unanimously.

Mr. Cottrill stated that Anthony Wayne Avenue rehabilitation, a joint project between Lockland and Lincoln Heights, had been funded for a grant of \$481,750. The County will provide local match for this project from the Municipal Road Fund.

Mr. Cottrill requested comments on the Draft Round 11 Rating System that had been mailed to the Committee Members previously.

Under Criterion 1 - Ability to Proceed on the Addendum to the Rating System, it was decided to change the last sentence to read "A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently cancelling the same after the bid date on the application, may be considered as having a delinquent project". Designation, of course, would be at the discretion of the Integrating Committee.

On the rating sheet under 3) regarding facility's serviceability, it was suggested to change the 2 point category to read "Project design is for minimal increase in capacity", not "demand", as was originally worded.

Under Criterion 4 - Health, Safety & Welfare on the Addendum, the Committee requested examples be included in each category which will give the jurisdictions some guidelines.

60th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes

April 18, 1996

Another suggestion by Committee Members under 5) Economic Health was to reduce the number of points from 10 to 5. It would be 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, rather than 2, 4, 6, 8, 10.

Under 10) it was suggested by some Committee Members to increase the importance of the jurisdiction enactment of the \$5 license plate fee or some sort of dedicated levy for infrastructure purposes, from a 2 point item to a 5 point item. They would like to see it be 5, 3, 0 in lieu of 2, 1, 0.

The Support Staff was requested to take these suggestions and see how they can be implemented into the rating system criteria.

Chairman Brayshaw concurred with Mr. Seitz that the recommendations were worthy of further consideration.

With Mr. Huddleston having to leave, the Committee agreed to hold this question until the Support Staff could analyze the changes. It was unanimously agreed to meet on May 24, 1996 at 8:00 a.m. to finalize the rating system in order to get it to OPWC before the June 28, 1996 deadline.

Small Governments - Mr. Sykes gave a synopsis of our projects that were submitted and indicated that it will all be contingent on some other large projects that have been submitted for Small Government funding, but it looks like District 2 may have as many as five Small Government projects. Voting on projects will be May 14 so by our next meeting we will know which projects have been approved.


Old Business - None

New Business - Mr. Cottrill reported there will be a press conference held on Friday, June 28, 1996 - 10:30 a.m. at which time Mr. Bicking will distribute the Round 10 project agreements to the respective jurisdictions.

Mr. Brayshaw announced that the County Engineer's Office was having a seminar for maintenance, design and construction type people at the Springfield Township Grove on Winton Road and invited all to attend.

Mr. Seitz moved adjournment; seconded by Mr. Heile and approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joan Cornelius  
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff

# County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-5323

FAX (513) 723-9748

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes (Amended)  
May 24, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room  
Room 603, County Administration Building  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:15 a.m. Mr. Hamner was the only Committee Member not present.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Bass, Pettit, Vogel, Beck and Riddiough. Also present from the City of Cincinnati was Prem Garg and his intern Chris Nyberg, in addition to Cathy Concilla from OPWC.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the April 18, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mayor Savage and passed unanimously.

Round 10 Funding - The latest status report from OPWC indicated that we have \$284,000 available under SCIP for distribution. The next project on the list, from North College Hill, needed \$741,000; consequently, North College Hill passed. The next project on the list, from Elmwood Place, was originally submitted with a \$475,000 request, but can proceed with the available funding. A small balance is available under LTIP, but not enough to generate any interest from the next group of jurisdictions on the list.

Revolving Loan Program (RLP) - More information on this program was provided by OPWC at a recent District Leadership Conference attended by the Chairman and three Support Staff Members. The RLP will begin with Round 12, and is intended to fund loan projects after SCIP loan funding has already been exhausted. Also, OPWC stated the allocation may be accumulated at the discretion of the Committee. (A Policy/Implementation report was distributed to the Committee for their information.)

Senate Bill 257 - The implementation legislation for Rounds 11 through 20 of State Issue 2 has become law. Some amendments were added to the original bill as it progressed through the General Assembly, but nothing that will drastically affect our District. One change that should simplify matters for Districts changes the current minimum requirement for 22% loans and 8% credit enhancements. The new guidelines stipulate a minimum of only 20% for loans and credit enhancements combined.

Round 11 Allocations - Preliminary figures indicate that we can expect to receive \$8,300,000 under SCIP and \$4,307,000 under LTIP, which are the same amounts as last year.

Unfinished Support Staff Business from Last Month:

Rating System for Round 11 - The Committee reviewed the draft Rating System presented for consideration last month. At that meeting, the Committee had reviewed and approved in concept the suggested change in Criterion #10, which awards points to a jurisdiction for enacting an infrastructure levy, the optional \$5 license plate fee, user fees, and/or a dedicated tax for infrastructure. The suggested change would award five points if two or more of these measures were adopted, three points if one measure was adopted, and zero points if no measures were adopted. In addition, the Integrating Committee considered the issues presented by Messrs. Seitz, Savage Sykes and Brooks and decided to endorse the group's recommendation of raising the maximum number of "Condition" points to 25 from 20. In light of today's recommendation to raise the maximum number of "Condition" points, and last month's recommendation to raise the available points under Criterion #10, Mr. Seitz moved to adopt the Round 11 Rating System as revised/clarified by the Support Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sykes, then was passed unanimously.

Schedule for District Activities Involving Round 11 - The Support Staff presented a recommended schedule, which was ratified by a unanimous vote, subsequent to an adoption motion by Mr. Savage and a second by Mr. Huddleston.

Small Governments Subcommittee report - Mr. Sykes reported that the Village of Lincoln Heights, Village of Woodlawn, Columbia Township and Village of Terrace Park all were approved for a total of \$988,210, and the Villages of Greenhills and Newtown were put on the contingency list. Chairman Brayshaw commented that Mr. Sykes has done an excellent job in representing the Small Governments and the Committee gave him a hearty round of applause. Mr. Sykes, in turn, thanked everyone.

Old Business - None

New Business - Mr. Cottrill reminded the Committee of the Press Conference being held on June 28, 1996 during which time Mr. Larry Bicking will present the Round 10 approved Project Agreements including the Small Government approved Project Agreements.

Mayor Brooks asked Chairman Brayshaw if he could perceive seeing the Anderson Township situation (landslides) coming before Issue 2 on an emergency basis. Chairman Brayshaw proceeded to give an update on where the situation stands. Mr. Cline reiterated that the Emergency OPWC Applications need not go through the District Integrating Committee. This was confirmed by our Program Representative, Cathy Concilla.

Mr. Cottrill stated that unless something comes up that he would feel the Committee needs to convene, additional summer meetings would be superfluous and we can likely cancel the entire summer meeting schedule.

Mayor Savage moved adjournment; seconded by Mr. Heile and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Joan Cornelius*  
Joan Cornelius  
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff



County Commissioner's Conference Room  
County Administration Building  
Room 603  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
November 1, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

## AGENDA

- 1.) Approval of previous meeting's minutes
- 2.) Report by District Liaison on status of Round 11 projects.
- 3.) Discussion:  
Criterion No. 1 - Penalty of five points for 3 applicants.
- 4.) Small Governments Subcommittee report.
- 5.) Old business.
- 6.) New business.
- 7.) *Next meeting date is Friday, December 6, 1996, to vote on Round 11 projects!*

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>	<u>PHONE NO.</u>
Peter Heile	City of Cincinnati	352-3337
RICHARD MENDES	" "	352-2457
John Hammer	" "	352-3218
Joe Sykes DAN BROOKS	Miami Township NORTH COLLEGE HILL	941 2466 521-7413
[Signature]	Ham County Commissioner	771-0900
Bill Brayshaw	Ham. County Engineer	632-8630